arXiv:0805.0625v1 [math.AP] 6 May 2008

Logarithmic decay of hyperbolic equations with arbitrary boundary damping

Xiaoyu Fu*

Abstract

In this paper, we study the logarithmic stability for the hyperbolic equations by arbitrary boundary observation. Based on Carleman estimate, we first prove an estimate of the resolvent operator of such equation. Then we prove the logarithmic stability estimate for the hyperbolic equations without any assumption on an observation subboundary.

2000 Mathematics Subject Classification. Primary 93B05; Secondary 93B07, 35B37.

Key Words. Logarithmic stability, hyperbolic equations, Carleman estimate, resolvent operator.

1 Introduction and main result

Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a bounded domain with boundary $\partial\Omega$ of class C^2. Denote by $\nu = (\nu_1, \cdots, \nu_n)$ the unit outward normal field along the boundary $\partial\Omega$, and $\overline{\Omega}$ the closure of Ω. For simplicity, in the sequel, we use the notation $u_j = \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_j}$, where x_j is the j-th coordinate of a generic point $x = (x_1, \cdots, x_n)$ in $\mathbb{R}^n$. In a similar manner, we use the notation w_j, v_j, etc. for the partial derivatives of w and v with respect to x_j. By $\overline{c}$ we denote the complex conjugate of $c \in \mathbb{C}$. Throughout this paper, we will use C to denote a generic positive constant which may vary from line to line (unless otherwise stated).

Let $a^{jk}(\cdot) \in C^2(\overline{\Omega};\ \mathbb{R})$ be fixed satisfying

$$a^{jk} = a^{jk}(x) = a^{kj}(x), \qquad \forall\ x \in \overline{\Omega},\ j, k = 1, 2, \cdots, n, \tag{1.1}$$

and for some constant $\beta > 0$,

$$\sum_{j,k=1}^{n} a^{jk}(x)\xi^j\overline{\xi}^k \geq \beta|\xi|^2, \qquad \forall\ (x, \xi) \in \overline{\Omega} \times \mathbb{C}^n, \tag{1.2}$$

---

[*] School of Mathematics, Sichuan University, Chengdu 610064, China. This work was partially supported by the NSF of China under grants 10525105 and 10771149. The author gratefully acknowledges Dr. Kim-Dang Phung and Prof. Xu Zhang for their helps. *E-mail:* `rj_xy@163.com`.

where $\xi = (\xi^1, \cdots, \xi^n)$. Define a formal differential operator $\mathcal{P}$ (associated with the matrix $(a^{jk}(\cdot))_{n\times n}$) as follows:

$$\mathcal{P} \overset{\triangle}{=} \sum_{j,k=1}^{n} \partial_k(a^{jk}\partial_j). \tag{1.3}$$

Fix a real valued function $a(\cdot) \in C^1(\partial\Omega;\ \mathbb{R}^+)$. In what follows, we assume that

$$\Gamma_0 \overset{\triangle}{=} \{x \in \partial\Omega;\ a(x) > 0\} \neq \emptyset. \tag{1.4}$$

The main purpose of this article is to study the logarithmic decay of the following hyperbolic equations with a boundary damping term $a(x)u_t$:

$$\begin{cases} u_{tt} - \mathcal{P}u = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^+ \times \Omega, \\ \displaystyle\sum_{j,k=1}^{n} a^{jk}u_j\nu_k = 0 & \text{on } \mathbb{R}^+ \times \partial\Omega \setminus \Gamma_0, \\ \displaystyle\sum_{j,k=1}^{n} a^{jk}u_j\nu_k + a(x)u_t = 0 & \text{on } \mathbb{R}^+ \times \Gamma_0, \\ (u(0), u_t(0)) = (u^0, u^1) & \text{in } \Omega. \end{cases} \tag{1.5}$$

Very interesting logarithmic decay results were given in [4, 11] for the above system under the regularity assumption that $a^{jk}(\cdot)$, $a(\cdot)$ and $\partial\Omega$ are C^∞-smooth ([11] considered the special case $(a^{jk})_{n\times n} = I$, the identity matrix). Note that, since the sub-boundary Γ_δ in which the damping $a(x)u_t$ is (uniformly) effective may be very "small", the "geometric optics condition" introduced in [3] is not guaranteed for system (1.5), and therefore, in general, one can not expect exponential stability of this system. On the other hand, as pointed in [4, 11], for some special case of system (1.5), logarithmic stability is the best decay rate.

Put $H \overset{\triangle}{=} H^1(\Omega) \times L^2(\Omega)$. Define an unbounded operator $A:\ H \to H$ by (Recall that $u_j^0 = \frac{\partial u^0}{\partial x_j}$)

$$\begin{cases} A \overset{\triangle}{=} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & I \\ \mathcal{P} & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \\ D(A) \overset{\triangle}{=} \Big\{ u = (u^0, u^1) \in H;\ Au \in H\ , \\ \qquad\qquad \displaystyle\sum_{j,k=1}^{n} a^{jk}u_j^0\nu_k\Big|_{\partial\Omega\setminus\Gamma_0} = 0,\ \Big(\sum_{j,k=1}^{n} a^{jk}u_j^0\nu_k + au^1\Big)\Big|_{\Gamma_0} = 0 \Big\}. \end{cases} \tag{1.6}$$

It is easy to show that A generates a group $\{e^{tA}\}_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$ on H.

The main result of this paper is stated as follows:

Theorem 1.1 *Let $a^{jk}(\cdot) \in C^2(\overline{\Omega};\ \mathbb{R})$ satisfy (1.1)–(1.2) and $a(\cdot) \in C^1(\partial\Omega;\ \mathbb{R}^+)$ satisfy (1.4). Then solutions $e^{tA}(u^0, u^1) \equiv (u, u_t) \in C(\mathbb{R};\ D(A)) \cap C^1(\mathbb{R};\ H)$ of system (1.5) satisfy*

$$||e^{tA}(u^0, u^1)||_H \leq \frac{C}{\ln(2+t)}||(u^0, u^1)||_{D(A)}, \qquad \forall\ (u^0, u^1) \in D(A),\ \forall\ t > 0. \tag{1.7}$$

Following [1] (see also [4]), Theorem 1.1 is a consequence of the following resolvent estimate for operator A:

Theorem 1.2 *Under the assumptions in Theorem 1.1, there exists a constant* $C > 0$ *such that*

i) if $\lambda \in \mathrm{Sp}\,(A) \setminus \{0\}$, *then*

$$\mathrm{Re}\,\lambda < -\frac{e^{-C|\mathrm{Im}\,\lambda|}}{C};$$

ii) if

$$\mathrm{Re}\,\lambda \in \left[-\frac{e^{-C|\mathrm{Im}\,\lambda|}}{C}, 0\right],$$

then

$$||(A - \lambda I)^{-1}||_{\mathcal{L}(H)} \leq Ce^{C|\mathrm{Im}\,\lambda|}, \quad \textit{for } |\lambda| > 1.$$

We shall develop an approach based on global Carleman estimate to prove Theorem 1.2, which is the main novelty of this paper. Our approach, stimulated by [10] (see also [6, 8, 17, 18]), is different from that in [1], which instead employed the classical local Carleman estimate and therefore needs C^∞-regularity for the data.

It would be quite interesting to establish better decay rate (than logarithmic decay) for system (1.5) under further conditions (without geometric optics condition). There are some impressive results in this respect, say [2, 12, 13, 14] for polynomial decay of system (1.5) with special geometries. However, to the best of the author's knowledge, the full picture of this problem is still unclear. We refer to [5, 15, 19] for related works.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. In section 2, we collect some useful preliminary results which will be useful later. Another key preliminary, global Carleman estimate for elliptic equations without inhomogeneous boundary condition, is established in section 3. Sections 4–5 are addressed to the proof of our main results.

2 Some preliminaries

In this section, we collect some preliminaries which will be used in the sequel.

To begin with, we recall the following result (which is an easy consequence of known result in [9, 16], for example).

Lemma 2.1 *There exists a function* $\hat{\psi} \in C^2(\overline{\Omega})$ *such that*

$$\begin{cases} \hat{\psi} > 0 & \textit{in } \Omega, \\ |\nabla \hat{\psi}| > 0 & \textit{in } \overline{\Omega}, \\ \displaystyle\sum_{j,k=1}^{n} a^{jk} \hat{\psi}_j \nu_k \leq 0 & \textit{on } \partial\Omega \setminus \Gamma_0. \end{cases} \tag{2.1}$$

Next, for $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we denote by $O(\mu^n)$ a function of order μ^n for large μ (which is independent of λ); by $O_\mu(\lambda^n)$ a function of order λ^n for fixed μ and for large λ. We now show the following pointwise estimate, which is a consequence of [8, Theorem 2.1] (see also [7]).

Lemma 2.2 *Let* $a^{jk} \in C^2(\mathbb{R}^{1+n};\ \mathbb{R})$ *satisfying (1.1). Assume* $z \in C^2(\mathbb{R}^{1+n};\ \mathbb{C})$, $\Psi \in C^2(\mathbb{R}^{1+n};\mathbb{R})$ *and* $\ell \in C^4(\mathbb{R}^{1+n};\mathbb{R})$. *Set*

$$\theta = e^{\ell}, \quad v = \theta z, \quad \Psi = -2\ell_{ss} - 2\sum_{j,k=1}^{n}(a^{jk}\ell_j)_k. \tag{2.2}$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned}
&\theta^2\Big|z_{ss} + \sum_{j,k=1}^{n}(a^{jk}z_j)_k\Big|^2 + M_s + \operatorname{div} V \\
&\geq 2\Big(3\ell_{ss} + \sum_{j,k=1}^{n}(a^{jk}\ell_j)_k\Big)|v_s|^2 + 4\sum_{j,k=1}^{n}a^{jk}\ell_{js}(v_k\overline{v}_s + \overline{v}_k v_s) \\
&\quad + \sum_{j,k=1}^{n}c^{jk}(v_k\overline{v}_j + \overline{v}_k v_j) + B|v|^2,
\end{aligned} \tag{2.3}$$

where

$$\left\{\begin{aligned}
&A = \ell_s^2 + \sum_{j,k=1}^{n}a^{jk}\ell_j\ell_k - \ell_{ss} - \sum_{j,k=1}^{n}(a^{jk}\ell_j)_k - \Psi, \\
&M = 2\ell_s(|v_s|^2 - \sum_{j,k=1}^{n}a^{jk}\overline{v}_j v_k) + 2\sum_{j=1}^{n}a^{jk}\ell_j(\overline{v}_s v_j + v_s\overline{v}_j) \\
&\qquad -\Psi(\overline{v}_s v + v_s\overline{v}) + (2A\ell_s + \Psi_s)|v|^2, \\
&V = [V_1, \cdots, V_k, \cdots, V_n], \\
&V_k = \sum_{j,j',k'=1}^{n}\Big\{ -2a^{jk}\ell_j|v_s|^2 + 2a^{jk}\ell_s(\overline{v}_j v_s + v_j\overline{v}_s) - \Psi a^{jk}(v_j\overline{v} + \overline{v}_j v) \\
&\qquad +\Big(2a^{jk'}a^{j'k} - a^{jk}a^{j'k'}\Big)\ell_j(v_{j'}\overline{v}_{k'} + \overline{v}_{j'}v_{k'}) + a^{jk}(2A\ell_j + \Psi_j - 2a\ell_j\ell_t)|v|^2\Big\}, \\
&c^{jk} = \sum_{j',k'=1}^{n}\Big[2(a^{j'k}\ell_{j'})_{k'}a^{jk'} - a^{jk}_{k'}a^{j'k'}\ell_{j'} + a^{jk}(a^{j'k'}\ell_{j'})_{k'}\Big] + a^{jk}\ell_{ss}, \\
&B = \sum_{j,k=1}^{n}(a^{jk}\Psi_k)_j + 2(A\ell_s)_s + 2\sum_{j,k=1}^{n}(Aa^{jk}\ell_j)_k + 2A\Psi.
\end{aligned}\right. \tag{2.4}$$

In particular, for any function $\psi \in C^4(\mathbb{R}^{1+n};\ \mathbb{R})$ *satisfying* $\psi_{sj} = 0$ *(j=1,...,n), and any* $\lambda, \mu > 1$, *choosing the function* $\ell(s,x)$ *to be*

$$\ell = \lambda\phi, \quad \phi = e^{\mu\psi}, \tag{2.5}$$

then

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{Left hand side of (2.3)} &\geq 2\Big[\lambda\mu^2\phi\sum_{j,k=1}^{n}a^{jk}\psi_j\psi_k + \lambda\phi O(\mu)\Big]\Big(|v_s|^2 + \sum_{j,k=1}^{n}a^{jk}v_j\overline{v}_k\Big) \\
&\quad +2\Big[\lambda^3\mu^4\phi^3\Big|\sum_{j,k=1}^{n}a^{jk}\psi_j\psi_k\Big|^2 + \lambda^3\phi^3 O(\mu^3) + O_\mu(\lambda^2)\Big]|v|^2.
\end{aligned} \tag{2.6}$$

Proof. Using Theorem 2.1 in [8] with $m = 1 + n$, and

$$t = s, \quad (a^{jk})_{m\times m} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & (a^{jk})_{n\times n} \end{pmatrix}.$$

By a direct calculation, we obtain (2.3).

On the other hand, by (2.5) and note that $\psi_{sj} = 0$ $(j = 1, \dots, n)$, it is easy to check that

$$\begin{cases} \ell_s = \lambda\mu\phi\psi_s, \qquad \ell_j = \lambda\mu\phi\psi_j, \\ \ell_{ss} = \lambda\mu^2\phi\psi_s^2 + \lambda\mu\phi\psi_{ss}, \quad \ell_{jk} = \lambda\mu^2\phi\psi_j\psi_k + \lambda\mu\phi\psi_{jk}, \quad \ell_{js} = \lambda\mu^2\phi\psi_s\psi_j. \end{cases} \tag{2.7}$$

Next, recalling the definition of c^{jk} in (2.4), by (2.7) and note that a^{jk} satisfies (1.1), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&2\Big(3\ell_{ss} + \sum_{j,k=1}^n (a^{jk}\ell_j)_k\Big)|v_s|^2 + 4\sum_{j,k=1}^n a^{jk}\ell_{js}(v_k\overline{v}_s + \overline{v}_k v_s) + \sum_{j,k=1}^n c^{jk}(v_k\overline{v}_j + \overline{v}_k v_j) \\
&= 2\Big\{\lambda\mu^2\phi\Big[3|\psi_s|^2 + \sum_{j,k=1}^n a^{jk}\psi_j\psi_k\Big] + \lambda\phi O(\mu)\Big\}|v_s|^2 + 8\lambda\mu^2\phi\sum_{j,k=1}^n a^{jk}\psi_j\psi_s v_k\overline{v}_s \\
&\quad + 4\lambda\mu^2\Big|\sum_{j,k=1}^n a^{jk}\psi_j\overline{v}_k\Big|^2 + 2\Big\{\lambda\mu^2\phi\Big[\sum_{j,k=1}^n a^{jk}\psi_j\psi_k + |\psi_s|^2\Big] + \lambda\phi O(\mu)\Big\}\sum_{j,k=1}^n a^{jk}v_k\overline{v}_j \\
&= 4\lambda\mu^2\phi\Big|\psi_s v_s + \sum_{j,k=1}^n a^{jk}\psi_j v_k\Big|^2 + 4\lambda\mu^2\Big|\sum_{j,k=1}^n a^{jk}\psi_j\overline{v}_k\Big|^2 \\
&\quad + 2\Big\{\lambda\mu^2\phi\Big[\sum_{j,k=1}^n a^{jk}\psi_j\psi_k + |\psi_s|^2\Big] + \lambda\phi O(\mu)\Big\}\Big(|v_s|^2 + \sum_{j,k=1}^n a^{jk}v_j\overline{v}_k\Big) \\
&\geq 2\Big[\lambda\mu^2\phi\sum_{j,k=1}^n a^{jk}\psi_j\psi_k + \lambda\phi O(\mu)\Big]\Big(|v_s|^2 + \sum_{j,k=1}^n a^{jk}v_j\overline{v}_k\Big).
\end{aligned} \tag{2.8}$$

Further, by (2.7) and recalling (2.4) and (2.2) for the definition of A and Ψ, respectively, we have

$$\begin{cases} \Psi = 2\lambda\mu^2\phi\Big[|\psi_s|^2 + \sum_{j,k=1}^n a^{jk}\psi_j\psi_k\Big] + \lambda\phi O(\mu), \\ A = (\lambda^2\mu^2\phi^2 + \lambda\mu^2\phi)\Big[|\psi_s|^2 + \sum_{j,k=1}^n a^{jk}\psi_j\psi_k\Big] + \lambda\phi O(\mu). \end{cases} \tag{2.9}$$

Therefore, by (2.4), and note that a^{jk} satisfies (1.2), we have

$$\begin{aligned} B &= 2\lambda^3\mu^4\phi^3\Big|\sum_{j,k=1}^n a^{jk}\psi_j\psi_k + |\psi_s|^2\Big|^2 + \lambda^3\phi^3 O(\mu^3) + O_\mu(\lambda^2) \\ &\geq 2\lambda^3\mu^4\phi^3\Big|\sum_{j,k=1}^n a^{jk}\psi_j\psi_k\Big|^2 + \lambda^3\phi^3 O(\mu^3) + O_\mu(\lambda^2). \end{aligned} \tag{2.10}$$

Combining (2.3), (2.8) and (2.10), we arrive at the desired result (2.6). □

Finally, similar to [17, Lemma 3.3], we have the following result.

Lemma 2.3 *Let* $a^{jk}\in C^1(\overline{\Omega})$ *satisfy (1.1), and* $g\overset{\triangle}{=}(g^1,\cdots,g^n):\mathbb{R}_t\times\mathbb{R}^n_x\to\mathbb{R}^n$ *be a vector field of class* C^1*. Then for any* $w\in C^2(\mathbb{R}_t\times\mathbb{R}^n_x;\mathbb{C})$*, we have*

$$\begin{aligned}
&-\sum_{k=1}^n\left[(g\cdot\overline{\nabla w})\sum_{j=1}^n a^{jk}w_j+(g\cdot\nabla w)\sum_{j=1}^n a^{jk}\overline{w}_j-g^k\left(|w_s|^2+\sum_{i,l=1}^n a^{jl}w_j\overline{w}_l\right)\right]_k\\
&=-\left[w_{ss}+\sum_{j,k=1}^n(a^{jk}w_j)_k\right]g\cdot\overline{\nabla w}-\overline{\left(w_{ss}+\sum_{j,k=1}^n(a^{jk}w_j)_k\right)}g\cdot\nabla w\\
&\quad+(w_sg\cdot\overline{\nabla w}+\overline{w}_sg\cdot\nabla w)_s-(w_sg_s\cdot\overline{\nabla w}+\overline{w}_sg\cdot\nabla w)\\
&\quad+(\nabla\cdot g)|w_s|^2-2\sum_{j,k,l=1}^n a^{jk}w_j\overline{w}_l\frac{\partial g^l}{\partial x_k}+\sum_{j,k=1}^n w_j\overline{w}_k\nabla\cdot(a^{jk}g).
\end{aligned}\tag{2.11}$$

Proof. On the one hand, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&w_{ss}g\cdot\overline{\nabla w}+\overline{w}_{ss}g\cdot\nabla w\\
&=(w_sg\cdot\overline{\nabla w}+\overline{w}_sg\cdot\nabla w)_s-(w_sg_s\cdot\overline{\nabla w}+\overline{w}_sg\cdot\nabla w)\\
&\quad-\sum_{j=1}^n(g^j|w_s|^2)_j+(\nabla\cdot g)|w_s|^2.
\end{aligned}\tag{2.12}$$

On the other hand, by (1.1), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{j,k=1}^n(a^{jk}w_j)_kg\cdot\overline{\nabla w}+\overline{\sum_{j,k=1}^n(a^{jk}w_j)_kg}\cdot\nabla w\\
&=\sum_{j,k=1}^n\Big[a^{jk}w_jg\cdot\overline{\nabla w}+a^{jk}\overline{w}_jg\cdot\nabla w\Big]_k-2\sum_{j,k,l=1}^n a^{jk}w_j\overline{w}_l\frac{\partial g^l}{\partial x_k}\\
&\quad-\sum_{j,k,l=1}^n(a^{jk}g^lw_j\overline{w}_k)_l+\sum_{j,k=1}^n w_jw_k\nabla\cdot(a^{jk}g).
\end{aligned}\tag{2.13}$$

Combining (2.12)–(2.13), we get the desired result. □

3 Global Carleman estimate for elliptic equations without inhomogeneous boundary condition

In this section, we shall derive a global Carleman estimate for elliptic equations with nonhomogeneous and complex Neumann-like boundary condition.

Denote

$$X=(-2,2)\times\Omega,\quad \Sigma=(-2,2)\times\partial\Omega,\quad Y=(-1,1)\times\Omega,\quad Z=(-2,2)\times\Gamma_0.$$

Let us consider the following elliptic equation:

$$\begin{cases} z_{ss} + \displaystyle\sum_{j,k=1}^{n} (a^{jk} z_j)_k = z^0 & \text{in } (-2,2)\times\Omega, \\ \displaystyle\sum_{j,k=1}^{n} a^{jk} z_j \nu_k = 0 & \text{on } (-2,2)\times\partial\Omega\setminus\Gamma_0, \\ \displaystyle\sum_{j,k=1}^{n} a^{jk} z_j \nu_k - ia(x) z_s = a(x) z^1 & \text{on } (-2,2)\times\Gamma_0. \end{cases} \tag{3.1}$$

We now show the following Carleman estimate.

Theorem 3.1 *Under the assumptions in Theorem 1.1, there exists a constant* $C > 0$ *such that, for any* $\varepsilon > 0$*, any solution* $z \in C((-2,2);\ H^1(\Omega)) \cap C^1((-2,2);\ L^2(\Omega))$ *of system (3.1) satisfies*

$$\begin{aligned} ||z||_{H^1(Y)} \le Ce^{C\varepsilon}\Big[||z^0||_{L^2(X)} + ||z^1||_{L^2(\Sigma)} + ||z||_{L^2(Z)} + ||z_s||_{L^2(Z)}\Big] \\ +Ce^{-2/\varepsilon}||z||_{H^1(X)}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.2}$$

Remark 3.1 *For the general case of* $t \in (T_1, T_2)$ *with* $T_1, T_2 \in \mathbb{R}$*. By setting* $s = t - \frac{T_2+T_1}{2}$*, one deduces that*

$$s \in (-\alpha, \alpha), \quad \alpha \triangleq \frac{T_2 - T_1}{2}.$$

Then by scaling, one need consider only the case of (3.1).

Proof. We divide the proof into several steps.

Step 1. Note that there is no boundary condition for z at $s = \pm 2$. Therefore, we need to introduce a cut-off function $\varphi = \varphi(s) \in C_0^\infty(-b, b) \subset C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ such that

$$\begin{cases} 0 \le \varphi(s) \le 1 & |s| < b, \\ \varphi(s) = 1, & |s| \le b_0, \end{cases} \tag{3.3}$$

where b_0 and b (satisfying $1 < b_0 < b < 2$) will be given later. Put

$$\hat{z} = \varphi z. \tag{3.4}$$

Then, noting that φ does not depend on x, by (3.1), it follows

$$\begin{cases} \hat{z}_{ss} + \displaystyle\sum_{j,k=1}^{n} (a^{jk} \hat{z}_j)_k = \varphi_{ss} z + 2\varphi_s z_s + \varphi z^0 & \text{in } (-2,2)\times\Omega, \\ \displaystyle\sum_{j,k=1}^{n} a^{jk} \hat{z}_j \nu_k = 0 & \text{on } (-2,2)\times\partial\Omega\setminus\Gamma_0, \\ \displaystyle\sum_{j,k=1}^{n} a^{jk} \hat{z}_j \nu_k - ia(x)\hat{z}_s = -ia(x)\varphi_s z + a(x)\varphi z^1 & \text{on } (-2,2)\times\Gamma_0. \end{cases} \tag{3.5}$$

Step 2. Put

$$b \overset{\triangle}{=} \sqrt{1+\frac{1}{\mu}\ln\left[(2+e^{\mu})e^{\frac{\mu\hat{\psi}(x)}{||\hat{\psi}||_{L^\infty(\Omega)}}}\right]}, \qquad b_0 \overset{\triangle}{=} \sqrt{b^2-\frac{1}{\mu}\ln\left[(1+e^{\mu})e^{\frac{\mu\hat{\psi}(x)}{||\hat{\psi}||_{L^\infty(\Omega)}}}\right]}, \tag{3.6}$$

where $\mu > \ln 2$, $\hat{\psi}(x) \in C^2(\overline{\Omega})$ is given by Lemma 2.1. It is easy to see that

$$1 < b_0 < b \leq 2. \tag{3.7}$$

Put

$$\psi = \psi(s,x) \overset{\triangle}{=} -\frac{\hat{\psi}(x)}{||\hat{\psi}||_{L^\infty(\Omega)}} + b^2 - s^2. \tag{3.8}$$

It is easy to check that

$$\begin{cases} \phi(s,\cdot) \geq 2+e^{\mu}, & \text{for any } s \text{ satisfying } |s| \leq 1, \\ \phi(s,\cdot) \leq 1+e^{\mu}, & \text{for any } s \text{ satisfying } b_0 \leq |s| \leq b. \end{cases} \tag{3.9}$$

On the other hand, by (3.8) and Lemma 2.1, we find

$$h \overset{\triangle}{=} |\nabla\psi| = \frac{1}{||\hat{\psi}||_{L^\infty(\Omega)}}|\nabla\hat{\psi}(x)| > 0, \qquad \text{in } \overline{\Omega}. \tag{3.10}$$

Next, recalling that a^{jk} satisfying (1.2) and by (3.10), we conclude that there exists a $\mu_0 > 1$, for any $\mu \geq \mu_0$, there exists $\lambda_0(\mu) > 1$ such that for any $\lambda \geq \lambda_1$, it holds

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{The right hand side of (2.6)} \\ &\geq \lambda\mu^2\phi\sum_{j,k=1}^{n}a^{jk}\psi_j\psi_k\Big(|v_s|^2+\sum_{j,k=1}^{n}a^{jk}v_j\overline{v}_k\Big) + \lambda^3\mu^4\phi^3\Big|\sum_{j,k=1}^{n}a^{jk}\psi_j\psi_k\Big|^2|v|^2 \\ &\geq \lambda\mu^2\beta h^2\phi\Big(|v_s|^2+\sum_{j,k=1}^{n}a^{jk}v_j\overline{v}_k\Big) + \lambda^3\mu^4\beta^2h^4\phi^3|v|^2. \end{aligned} \tag{3.11}$$

Now, integrating inequality (2.6) (with u replaced by $\hat{z}$) in $(-b,b)\times\Omega$, recalling that φ vanishes near $s = \pm b$, and by (3.5) and (3.11), one arrives at

$$\begin{aligned} &\lambda\mu^2\int_{-b}^{b}\int_\Omega \phi(|\nabla v|^2+|v_s|^2)dxds + \lambda^3\mu^4\int_{-b}^{b}\int_\Omega \phi^3|v|^2dxds \\ &\leq C\Big\{\int_{-b}^{b}\int_\Omega \theta^2|\varphi_{ss}z+2\varphi_sz_s+\varphi z^0|^2dxds + \int_{-b}^{b}\int_{\partial\Omega}V\cdot\nu dxds\Big\}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.12}$$

Recalling that $v = \theta\hat{z}$, by (2.7), we get

$$\frac{1}{C}\theta^2(|\nabla\hat{z}|^2+\lambda^2\mu^2\phi^2|\hat{z}|^2) \leq |\nabla v|^2+\lambda^2\mu^2\phi^2|v|^2 \leq C\theta^2(|\nabla\hat{z}|^2+\lambda^2\mu^2\phi^2|\hat{z}|^2). \tag{3.13}$$

Therefore, by (3.12) and (3.13), we end up with

$$\begin{aligned} &\lambda\mu^2\int_{-b}^{b}\int_\Omega \theta^2\phi(|\nabla\hat{z}|^2+|\hat{z}_s|^2)dxds + \lambda^3\mu^4\int_{-b}^{b}\int_\Omega \theta^2\phi^3|\hat{z}|^2dxds \\ &\leq C\Big\{\int_{-b}^{b}\int_\Omega \theta^2|\varphi_{ss}z+2\varphi_sz_s+\varphi z^0|^2dxds + \int_{-b}^{b}\int_{\partial\Omega}V\cdot\nu dxds\Big\}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.14}$$

Step 3. We now estimate $\int_{-b}^{b}\int_{\partial\Omega} V\cdot\nu dxds$. By (2.4) and nothing that $v=\theta\hat{z}$, it follows

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\int_{-b}^{b}\int_{\partial\Omega} V\cdot\nu dxds=\sum_{k=1}^{n}\int_{-b}^{b}\int_{\partial\Omega} V_k\nu_k dxds\\
&=\sum_{j,k,j',k'=1}^{n}\int_{-b}^{b}\int_{\partial\Omega}\Big\{-2a^{jk}\ell_j\nu_k|v_s|^2+2\ell_s a^{jk}\nu_k(\overline{v}_j v_s+v_j\overline{v}_s)-\Psi a^{jk}\nu_k(v_j\overline{v}+\overline{v}_j v)\\
&\quad+\Big(2a^{jk'}a^{j'k}-a^{jk}a^{j'k'}\Big)\ell_j(v_{j'}\overline{v}_{k'}+\overline{v}_{j'}v_{k'})\nu_k+a^{jk}\nu_k(2A\ell_j+\Psi_j-2a\ell_j\ell_t)|v|^2\Big\}dxds.
\end{aligned}
\tag{3.15}
$$

Note that, by (2.1) and (2.7), we know that

$$
\sum_{j,k=1}^{n}a^{jk}\ell_j\nu_k=\lambda\mu\phi\sum_{j,k=1}^{n}a^{jk}\psi_j\nu_k=-\frac{\lambda\mu\phi}{||\hat{\psi}||_{L^\infty(\Omega)}}\sum_{j,k=1}^{n}a^{jk}\hat{\psi}_j\nu_k\geq 0,\qquad\text{on }\partial\Omega\setminus\Gamma_0.
\tag{3.16}
$$

Hence, recalling that $v=\theta\hat{z}$, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
&-\sum_{j,k=1}^{n}\int_{-b}^{b}\int_{\partial\Omega}a^{jk}\ell_j\nu_k|v_s|^2dxds\leq C\lambda\mu\int_{-b}^{b}\int_{\Gamma_0}\phi|v_s|^2dxdt\\
&\leq Ce^{C\lambda}\int_{-b}^{b}\int_{\Gamma_0}(|\hat{z}_s|^2+|\hat{z}|^2)dxds.
\end{aligned}
\tag{3.17}
$$

Next, using $v=\theta\hat{z}$ again, noting that $\hat{z}$ vanishes near $s=\pm b$, by (1.4) and (3.5), we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{j,k=1}^{n}\int_{-b}^{b}\int_{\partial\Omega}\ell_s a^{jk}\nu_k(\overline{v}_j v_s+v_j\overline{v}_s)dxds-\sum_{j,k=1}^{n}\int_{-b}^{b}\int_{\partial\Omega}\Psi a^{jk}\nu_k(v_j\overline{v}+\overline{v}_j v)dxds\\
&=\sum_{j,k=1}^{n}\int_{-b}^{b}\int_{\partial\Omega}\theta^2\ell_s a^{jk}\nu_k(\overline{\hat{z}_j}\hat{z}_s+\hat{z}_j\overline{\hat{z}_s})dxds\\
&\quad+\sum_{j,k=1}^{n}\int_{-b}^{b}\int_{\partial\Omega}\theta^2(\ell_s^2-\Psi)a^{jk}\nu_k(\overline{\hat{z}_j}\hat{z}+\hat{z}_j\overline{\hat{z}})dxds\\
&\quad+\sum_{j,k=1}^{n}\int_{-b}^{b}\int_{\partial\Omega}\theta^2\ell_s a^{jk}\ell_j\nu_k(\hat{z}\overline{\hat{z}_s}+\overline{\hat{z}}\hat{z}_s)dxds\\
&\quad+2\sum_{j,k=1}^{n}\int_{-b}^{b}\int_{\partial\Omega}\theta^2(\ell_s^2-\Psi)a^{jk}\ell_j\nu_k|\hat{z}|^2dxds\\
&=\int_{-b}^{b}\int_{\Gamma_0}a(x)\theta^2\ell_s\Big[i\varphi_s(\hat{z}_s\overline{z}-\overline{\hat{z}_s}z)+\varphi(\overline{\hat{z}_s}z^1+\hat{z}_s\overline{z^1})\Big]dxds\\
&\quad+\int_{-b}^{b}\int_{\Gamma_0}a(x)\theta^2(\ell_s^2-\Psi)\Big[i(\hat{z}_s\overline{\hat{z}}-\overline{\hat{z}_s}\hat{z})+\varphi(\overline{z^1}\hat{z}+z^1\overline{\hat{z}})\Big]dxds\\
&\quad+\sum_{j,k=1}^{n}\int_{-b}^{b}\int_{\partial\Omega}(\theta^2\ell_s a^{jk}\ell_j\nu_k|\hat{z}|^2)_s dxds-\sum_{j,k=1}^{n}\int_{-b}^{b}\int_{\partial\Omega}\theta^2(\ell_{ss}+2\Psi)a^{jk}\ell_j\nu_k|\hat{z}|^2dxds\\
&\leq Ce^{C\lambda}\Big[\int_{-b}^{b}\int_{\Gamma_0}(|\hat{z}_s|^2+|\varphi_s z|^2+|\varphi z^1|^2)dxds+\int_{-b}^{b}\int_{\partial\Omega}|\hat{z}|^2dxds\Big].
\end{aligned}
\tag{3.18}
$$

Further, by (3.16), and noting that $v = \theta\hat{z}$, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{j,k,j',k'=1}^{n}\int_{-b}^{b}\int_{\partial\Omega}\Big(2a^{jk'}a^{j'k} - a^{jk}a^{j'k'}\Big)\ell_j(v_{j'}\overline{v}_{k'} + \overline{v}_{j'}v_{k'})\nu_k dxds\\
&= \sum_{j,k,j',k'=1}^{n}\int_{-b}^{b}\int_{\partial\Omega} a^{jk}\ell_j\nu_k a^{j'k'}(v_{j'}\overline{v}_{k'} + \overline{v}_{j'}v_{k'})dxds\\
&\le Ce^{C\lambda}\sum_{j',k'=1}^{n}\int_{-b}^{b}\int_{\partial\Omega\setminus\Gamma_0} a^{j'k'}(v_{j'}\overline{v}_{k'} + \overline{v}_{j'}v_{k'})dxds\\
&\le Ce^{C\lambda}\int_{-b}^{b}\int_{\partial\Omega\setminus\Gamma_0}\sum_{j,k=1}^{n}\Big[a^{jk}\hat{z}_j\overline{\hat{z}_k} + a^{jk}\ell_j\ell_k|\hat{z}|^2\Big]dxds.
\end{aligned}\tag{3.19}$$

Combining (3.15), (3.17)– (3.19), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{-b}^{b}\int_{\partial\Omega} V\cdot\nu dxds \le Ce^{C\lambda}\Big[&\int_{-b}^{b}\int_{\Gamma_0}(|\hat{z}_s|^2 + |\varphi_s z|^2 + |\varphi z^1|^2)dxds\\
&+\int_{-b}^{b}\int_{\partial\Omega\setminus\Gamma_0}|\nabla\hat{z}|^2dxds + \int_{-b}^{b}\int_{\partial\Omega}|\hat{z}|^2dxds\Big].
\end{aligned}\tag{3.20}$$

Step 4. Let us estimate $\int_{-b}^{b}\int_{\partial\Omega}|\hat{z}|^2dxds$ and $\int_{-b}^{b}\int_{\partial\Omega\setminus\Gamma_0}|\nabla\hat{z}|^2dxds$.

Firstly, by trace theory and Poincáre inequality, noting that $\hat{z}$ vanishes near $s = \pm b$, we have

$$\int_{-b}^{b}\int_{\partial\Omega}|\hat{z}|^2dxds \le C\int_{-b}^{b}\int_{\Omega}(|\hat{z}|^2 + |\nabla\hat{z}|^2)dxds \le C\int_{-b}^{b}\int_{\Omega}(|\hat{z}_s|^2 + |\nabla\hat{z}|^2)dxds. \tag{3.21}$$

Next, we choose a $g \in C^1(\overline{\Omega};\mathbb{R})$ such that $g = \nu$ on $\partial\Omega$. Integrating (2.11) (in Lemma 2.3) in $(-b,b)\times\Omega$, with w replaced by $\hat{z}$, using integrating by parts, and noting $\hat{z}(-b) = \hat{z}(b) = 0$, by (3.5) and using Poincáre inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&-\sum_{k=1}^{n}\int_{-b}^{b}\int_{\partial\Omega}\Big[(g\cdot\overline{\nabla\hat{z}})\sum_{j=1}^{n}a^{jk}\hat{z}_j\nu_k + (g\cdot\nabla\hat{z})\sum_{j=1}^{n}a^{jk}\overline{\hat{z}}_j\nu_k\Big]dxds\\
&\quad+\int_{-b}^{b}\int_{\partial\Omega}\Big(|\hat{z}_s|^2 + \sum_{j,l=1}^{n}a^{jl}\hat{z}_j\overline{\hat{z}}_l\Big)dxds\\
&= -\int_{-b}^{b}\int_{\Omega}\Big[\Big(\hat{z}_{ss} + \sum_{j,k=1}^{n}(a^{jk}\hat{z}_j)_k\Big)g\cdot\overline{\nabla\hat{z}} + \overline{\Big(\hat{z}_{ss} + \sum_{j,k=1}^{n}(a^{jk}\hat{z}_j)_k\Big)}g\cdot\nabla\hat{z}\Big]dxds\\
&\quad-\int_{-b}^{b}\int_{\Omega}(\hat{z}_s g_s\cdot\overline{\nabla\hat{z}} + \overline{\hat{z}}_s g\cdot\nabla\hat{z})dxds\\
&\quad+\int_{-b}^{b}\int_{\Omega}\Big[(\nabla\cdot g)|\hat{z}_s|^2 - 2\sum_{j,k,l=1}^{n}a^{jk}\hat{z}_j\overline{\hat{z}}_l\frac{\partial g^l}{\partial x_k} + \sum_{j,k=1}^{n}\hat{z}_j\overline{\hat{z}}_k\nabla\cdot(a^{jk}g)\Big]dxds\\
&\le C\int_{-b}^{b}\int_{\Omega}\Big[|\varphi_{ss}z + 2\varphi_s z_s + \varphi z^0|^2 + |\hat{z}_s|^2 + |\nabla\hat{z}|^2\Big]dxds\\
&\le C\int_{-b}^{b}\int_{\Omega}(|z^0|^2 + |\hat{z}_s|^2 + |\nabla\hat{z}|^2)dxds.
\end{aligned}\tag{3.22}$$

By (1.2), (3.5) and (3.22), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{-b}^{b}\int_{\partial\Omega}(|\hat{z}_s|^2+\beta|\nabla\hat{z}|^2)dxds \le \int_{-b}^{b}\int_{\partial\Omega}\Big(|\hat{z}_s|^2+\sum_{j,l=1}^{n}a^{jl}\hat{z}_j\overline{\hat{z}}_l\Big)dxds\\
&\le C\int_{-b}^{b}\int_{\Omega}(|\hat{z}_s|^2+|\nabla\hat{z}|^2+|z^0|^2)dxds\\
&\quad+\int_{-b}^{b}\int_{\Gamma_0}a(x)\Big[(g\cdot\overline{\nabla\hat{z}})(i\hat{z}_s-i\varphi_s z+\varphi z^1)+(g\cdot\nabla\hat{z})(-i\overline{\hat{z}_s}+i\varphi_s\overline{z}+\varphi\overline{z^1})\Big]dxds\\
&\le C\int_{-b}^{b}\int_{\Omega}(|\hat{z}_s|^2+|\nabla\hat{z}|^2+|z^0|^2)dxds\\
&\quad+\delta\int_{-b}^{b}\int_{\Gamma_0}|\nabla\hat{z}|^2dxds+C(\delta)\int_{-b}^{b}\int_{\Gamma_0}(|\varphi_s z|^2+|\hat{z}_s|^2+|\varphi z^1|^2)dxds
\end{aligned}\tag{3.23}$$

where $0<\delta<\beta$ is small, then

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{-b}^{b}\int_{\partial\Omega\setminus\Gamma_0}|\nabla\hat{z}|^2dxds\\
&\le C\Big[\int_{-b}^{b}\int_{\Omega}(|\hat{z}_s|^2+|\nabla\hat{z}|^2+|z^0|^2)dxds+\int_{-b}^{b}\int_{\Gamma_0}(|\hat{z}|^2+|\hat{z}_s|^2+|z^1|^2)dxds\Big].
\end{aligned}\tag{3.24}$$

Finally, by multiplying $\overline{\hat{z}}$ and $\hat{z}$ on the first equation of (3.5), respectively, using integrating by parts, by (1.2) and using Poincáre inequality, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
&2\int_{-b}^{b}\int_{\Omega}(|\hat{z}_s|^2+\beta|\nabla\hat{z}|^2)dxds\\
&\le\int_{-b}^{b}\int_{\Omega}\Big(2|\hat{z}_s|^2+\sum_{j,k=1}^{n}a^{jk}(\hat{z}_j\overline{\hat{z}_k}+\overline{\hat{z}_j}\hat{z}_k)\Big)dxds\\
&=\sum_{j,k=1}^{n}\int_{-b}^{b}\int_{\partial\Omega}\Big(\overline{\hat{z}}a^{jk}\hat{z}_j\nu_k+\hat{z}a^{jk}\overline{\hat{z}_j}\nu_k\Big)dxds-\int_{-b}^{b}\int_{\Omega}\varphi(z^0\overline{\hat{z}}+\overline{z}^0\hat{z})dxds\\
&\le C\Big[\int_{-b}^{b}\int_{\Gamma_0}(|\hat{z}|^2+|\hat{z}_s|^2+|z^1|^2)dxds\Big]+\frac{1}{\varepsilon^*}\int_{-b}^{b}\int_{\Omega}|z^0|^2dxds+\varepsilon^*\int_{-b}^{b}\int_{\Omega}|\hat{z}|^2dxds\\
&\le C\Big[\int_{-b}^{b}\int_{\Gamma_0}(|\hat{z}|^2+|\hat{z}_s|^2+|z^1|^2)dxds\Big]\\
&\quad+\frac{1}{\varepsilon^*}\int_{-b}^{b}\int_{\Omega}|z^0|^2dxds+C\varepsilon^*\int_{-b}^{b}\int_{\Omega}|\hat{z}_s|^2dxds.
\end{aligned}\tag{3.25}$$

Taking $\varepsilon^*=\frac{1}{C}$ small enough, and combining (3.21), (3.24) and (3.25), we get

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{-b}^{b}\int_{\partial\Omega}|\hat{z}|^2dxds+\int_{-b}^{b}\int_{\partial\Omega\setminus\Gamma_0}|\nabla\hat{z}|^2dxds\\
&\le C\Big[\int_{-b}^{b}\int_{\Gamma_0}(|\hat{z}|^2+|\hat{z}_s|^2+|z^1|^2)dxds+\int_{-b}^{b}\int_{\Omega}|z^0|^2dxds\Big].
\end{aligned}\tag{3.26}$$

By (3.20) and (3.26), and noting that $\hat{z} = \varphi z$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_{-b}^{b}\int_{\partial\Omega} V\cdot \nu dxds\\ &\leq Ce^{C\lambda}\Big[\int_{-b}^{b}\int_{\Omega}|z^0|^2dxds+\int_{-b}^{b}\int_{\Gamma_0}(|z|^2+|z_s|^2+|z^1|^2)dxds\Big].\end{aligned}\tag{3.27}$$

Step 5. Combing (3.14), (3.24) and (3.27), we end up with

$$\begin{aligned}&\lambda\mu^2\int_{-b}^{b}\int_{\Omega}\theta^2\phi(|\nabla z|^2+|z_s|^2)dxds+\lambda^3\mu^4\int_{-b}^{b}\int_{\Omega}\theta^2\phi^3|z|^2dxds\\ &\leq C\int_{-b}^{b}\int_{\Omega}\theta^2\phi^3|\varphi_{ss}z+2\varphi_s z_s+\varphi z^0|^2dxds\\ &\quad+Ce^{C\lambda}\Big[\int_{-b}^{b}\int_{\Omega}|z^0|^2dxdt+\int_{-b}^{b}\int_{\Gamma_0}(|z|^2+|z_s|^2+|z^1|^2)dxds\Big].\end{aligned}\tag{3.28}$$

Denote $c_0 = 2 + e^{\mu} > 1$, and recall (3.6) for $b_0 \in (1, b)$. Fixing the parameter μ in (3.28), using (3.3) and (3.9), one finds

$$\begin{aligned}&\lambda e^{2\lambda c_0}\int_{-1}^{1}\int_{\Omega}(|\nabla z|^2+|z_s|^2+|z|^2)dxds\\ &\leq Ce^{C\lambda}\Big\{\int_{-2}^{2}\int_{\Omega}|z^0|^2dxds+\int_{-2}^{2}\int_{\partial\Omega}|z^1|^2dxds+\int_{-2}^{2}\int_{\Gamma_0}(|z|^2+|z_s|^2)dxds\Big\}\\ &\quad+Ce^{2\lambda(c_0-1)}\int_{(-b,-b_0)\bigcup(b_0,b)}\int_{\Omega}(|z|^2+|z_s|^2)dxds.\end{aligned}\tag{3.29}$$

From (3.29), one concludes that there exists an $\varepsilon_2 > 0$ such that the desired inequality (3.2) holds for $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_2]$, which, in turn, implies that it holds for any $\varepsilon > 0$. This completes the proof of Theorem 3.1. □

4 Proof of Theorem 1.2

In this section, we will prove the existence and the estimate of the norm of the resolvent $(A - \lambda I)^{-1}$ when $\operatorname{Re}\lambda \in \big[-e^{-C|\operatorname{Im}\lambda|}/C, 0\big]$.

Proof. We divide the proof into two steps.

Step 1. First, let $f = (f^0, f^1) \in H$, and $u = (u^0, u^1) \in D(A)$ with the boundary condition $\sum_{j,k=1}^{n} a^{jk}u_j^0\nu_k\big|_{\partial\Omega\setminus\Gamma_0} = 0$, $\big(\sum_{j,k=1}^{n} a^{jk}u_j^0\nu_k + au^1\big)\big|_{\Gamma_0} = 0$.

Then, the following equation

$$(A - \lambda I)u = f \tag{4.1}$$

is equivalent to

$$\begin{cases} -\lambda u^0 + u^1 = f^0,\\ \sum_{j,k=1}^{n}(a^{jk}u_j^0)_k - \lambda u^1 = f^1.\end{cases}\tag{4.2}$$

Hence, by substituting u^1 by u^0 in the second equation of (4.2) and with the boundary condition, we have

$$\begin{cases} \sum_{j,k=1}^{n}(a^{jk}u^0_j)_k-\lambda^2u^0=\lambda f^0+f^1 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \sum_{j,k=1}^{n}a^{jk}u^0_j\nu_k=0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega\setminus\Gamma_0, \\ \sum_{j,k=1}^{n}a^{jk}u^0_j\nu_k+a\lambda u^0=-af^0 & \text{on } \Gamma_0, \\ u^1=f^0+\lambda u^0 & \text{in } \Omega. \end{cases} \tag{4.3}$$

Put

$$v=e^{i\lambda s}u^0. \tag{4.4}$$

It is easy check that v satisfying the following equation:

$$\begin{cases} v_{ss}+\sum_{j,k=1}^{n}(a^{jk}v_j)_k=(\lambda f^0+f^1)e^{i\lambda s} & \text{in } \mathbb{R}\times\Omega, \\ \sum_{j,k=1}^{n}a^{jk}v_j\nu_k=0 & \text{on } \mathbb{R}\times\partial\Omega\setminus\Gamma_0, \\ \sum_{j,k=1}^{n}a^{jk}v_j\nu_k-iav_s=-af^0e^{i\lambda s} & \text{on } \mathbb{R}\times\Gamma_0. \end{cases} \tag{4.5}$$

Step 2. By (4.4) and Remark 3.1, we have the following estimates.

$$\begin{cases} |u^0|_{H^1(\Omega)}\le Ce^{C|\mathrm{Im}\,\lambda|}|v|_{H^1(Y)}, \\ |v|_{H^1(X)}\le C(|\lambda|+1)e^{C|\mathrm{Im}\,\lambda|}|u^0|_{H^1(\Omega)}, \\ |v|_{L^2(Z)}\le Ce^{C|\mathrm{Im}\,\lambda|}|u^0|_{L^2(\Gamma_0)}, \quad |v_s|_{L^2(Z)}\le C|\lambda|e^{C|\mathrm{Im}\,\lambda|}|u^0|_{L^2(\Gamma_0)}. \end{cases} \tag{4.6}$$

Now, we apply v to Theorem 3.1, and combining (4.6), we have

$$|u^0|_{H^1(\Omega)}\le Ce^{C|\mathrm{Im}\,\lambda|}\Big[|f^0|_{H^1(\Omega)}+|f^1|_{L^2(\Omega)}+|u^0|_{L^2(\Gamma_0)}\Big]. \tag{4.7}$$

On the other hand, we multiplier (4.2) by $\overline{u}^0$, integrate it on Ω, we get

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_\Omega\Big(-\sum_{j,k=1}^{n}(a^{jk}u^0_j)_k+\lambda^2u^0\Big)\cdot\overline{u}^0dx \\ &=\lambda^2|u^0|^2_{L^2(\Omega)}+\sum_{j,k=1}^{n}\int_\Omega a^{jk}u^0_j\overline{u}^0_kdx-\sum_{j,k=1}^{n}\int_{\partial\Omega}a^{jk}u^0_j\nu_k\overline{u}^0dx \\ &=\lambda^2|u^0|^2_{L^2(\Omega)}+\sum_{j,k=1}^{n}\int_\Omega a^{jk}u^0_j\overline{u}^0_kdx+\int_{\partial\Omega}(a\lambda u^0+af^0)\overline{u}^0dx. \end{aligned} \tag{4.8}$$

By taking the imaginary part, we find,

$$\begin{aligned}&|\operatorname{Im}\lambda|\int_{\partial\Omega}a|u^0|^2dx\\&\le\Big|-\sum_{j,k=1}^{n}(a^{jk}u^0_j)_k+\lambda^2u^0\Big|_{L^2(\Omega)}|u^0|_{L^2(\Omega)}\\&\qquad+2|\operatorname{Im}\lambda||\operatorname{Re}\lambda||u^0|^2_{L^2(\Omega)}+C|f^0|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)}|\sqrt{a}u^0|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)}\\&\le C\Big[|(\lambda f^0+f^1)|_{L^2(\Omega)}|u^0|_{L^2(\Omega)}+|\operatorname{Im}\lambda||\operatorname{Re}\lambda||u^0|^2_{L^2(\Omega)}+|f^0|_{H^1(\Omega)}|u^0|_{H^1(\Omega)}\Big]\end{aligned}\tag{4.9}$$

Hence, combining (4.7) and (4.9), we have

$$|u^0|_{H^1(\Omega)}\le Ce^{C|\operatorname{Im}\lambda|}\Big[|f^0|_{H^1(\Omega)}+|f^1|_{L^2(\Omega)}+|\operatorname{Im}\lambda||\operatorname{Re}\lambda||u^0|_{H^1(\Omega)}\Big].\tag{4.10}$$

Therefore, we take

$$Ce^{C|\operatorname{Im}\lambda|}|\operatorname{Im}\lambda||\operatorname{Re}|\le\frac{1}{2},$$

which holds, as soon as $|\operatorname{Re}\lambda|\le -e^{C_0|\operatorname{Im}\lambda|}/C_0$ for some $C_0>0$. Then, we have

$$|u^0|_{H^1(\Omega)}\le Ce^{C|\operatorname{Im}\lambda|}(|f^0|_{H^1(\Omega)}+|f^1|_{L^2(\Omega)}).\tag{4.11}$$

Recalling that $u^1=f^0+\lambda u^0$, we have

$$|u^1|_{L^2(\Omega)}\le|f^0|_{L^2(\Omega)}+|\lambda||u^0|_{L^2(\Omega)}\le Ce^{C|\operatorname{Im}\lambda|}(|f^0|_{H^1(\Omega)}+|f^1|_{L^2(\Omega)}).\tag{4.12}$$

By (4.11)–(4.12), we know that $A-\lambda I$ is injective. Thus $A-\lambda I$ is bi-injective from $D(A)$ to H. And moreover,

$$||(A-\lambda I)^{-1}||_{\mathcal{L}(H,H)}\le Ce^{C|\operatorname{Im}\lambda|},\quad \operatorname{Re}\lambda\in(-e^{C|\operatorname{Im}\lambda|}/C,0),\qquad |\lambda|\ge 1.$$

This completes the proof of Theorem 1.2. □

5 Proof of Theorem 1.1

In this section, we adapt the proof of [1, Théorème 3] (and also the proof of [4, Theorem 3] on semigroups).

Proof of Theorem 1.1. By taking $\chi_1=\chi_2=I$, $A=iB$ and $k=2$ in [1, Théorème 3], we have

$$\Big|\Big|e^{tA}u\frac{1}{(I-A)^2}\Big|\Big|_H\le\left(\frac{C}{\ln(2+t)}\right)^2||u||_H,\tag{5.1}$$

that is

$$||e^{tA}u||_H\le\left(\frac{C}{\ln(2+t)}\right)^2||u||_{D(A^2)}.\tag{5.2}$$

By definition, $D(A)$ is the interpolate space between $D(A^0)=H$ and $D(A^2)$. Since

$$||e^{tA}u||_H\le C||u||_H.\tag{5.3}$$

Then, combining (5.2)–(5.3), by applying interpolation theorem, we get the desired result. □

References

[1] N. Burq, *Décroissance de l'énergie locale de l'équation des ondes pour le probléme extérieur et absence de résonance au voisinagage du réel, Acta Math.*, 180 (1998), 1–29.

[2] N. Burq and M. Hitrik, *Energy decay for damped wave equations on partially rectangular domains, Math. Res. Lett.*, 14 (2007), 35–47.

[3] C. Bardos, G. Lebeau and J. Rauch, *Sharp sufficient conditions for the observation, control, and stabilization of waves from the boundary, SIAM I. Control Optim.*, 30 (1992), 1024–1065.

[4] H. Christianson, *Applications of cutoff resolvent estimates to the wave equations,* Preprint.

[5] T. Duyckaerts, *Optimal decay rates of the energy of a hyperbolic-parabolic system coupled by an interface, Asymptot. Anal.*, 51 (2007), 17–45.

[6] T. Duyckaerts, X. Zhang and E. Zuazua, *On the optimality of the observability inequalities for parabolic and hyperbolic systems with potentials, Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire,* 25 (2008), 1–41.

[7] X. Fu, *A weighted identity for partial differential operators of second order and its applications, C. R. Math. Acad. Sci. Paris,* 342 (2006), 579–584.

[8] X. Fu, *Null controllability for the parabolic equations with a complex principal part,* Preprint.

[9] A. V. Fursikov and O. Yu. Imanuvilov, *Controllability of Evolution Equations,* Lecture Notes Series 34, Research Institute of Mathematics, Seoul National University, Seoul, Korea, 1994.

[10] M. M. Lavrent'ev, V. G. Romanov, S. P. Shishat.skii, *Ill-Posed Problems of Mathematics Physics and Analysis,* Translated from the Russian by J. R. Schulenberger, Translations of Mathematical Monographs, 64, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1986.

[11] G. Lebeau and L. Robbiano, *Stabilisation de l'équation des ondes par le bord, Duke Math. J.,* 86 (1997), 465–491.

[12] Z. Liu and B. Rao, *Characterization of polynomial decay rate for the solution of linear evolution equation, Z. angew. Math. Phys.*, 56 (2005), 630–644.

[13] K.-D. Phung, *Polynomial decay rate for the dissipative wave equation, J. Differential Equations,* 240 (2007), 92–124.

[14] K.-D. Phung, *Boundary stabilization for the wave equation in a bounded cylindrical domain, Discrete Contin. Dynam. Systems,* 20 (2008), 1057–1093.

[15] J. Rauch, X. Zhang and E. Zuazua, *Polynomial decay of a hyperbolic-parabolic coupled system, J. Math. Pures Appl.*, 84 (2005), no. 4, 407–470.

[16] G. Wang and L. Wang, *The Carleman inequality and its application to periodic optimal control governed by semilinear parabolic differential equations, J. Optim. Theory Appl.*, 118 (2003), 249–461.

[17] X. Zhang, *Explicit observability estimate for the wave equation with potential and its application, R. Soc. Lond. Proc. Ser. A Math. Phys. Eng. Sci.*, **456** (2000), 1101–1115.

[18] X. Zhang, *Explicit observability inequalities for the wave equation with lower order terms by means of Carleman inequalities, SIAM J. Control Optim.*, 39 (2000), 812–834.

[19] X. Zhang and E. Zuazua, *Long time behavior of a coupled heat-wave system arising in fluid-structure interaction, Arch. Rat. Mech. Anal.*, 184 (2007), 49–120.